



Arnold Schwarzenegger  
*Governor*

# EFFECTS OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OSCILLATION AND ENSO ON SEASONALLY AVERAGED TEMPERATURES IN CALIFORNIA

*Prepared For:*

**California Energy Commission**

Public Interest Energy Research Program

*Prepared By:*

**David W. Pierce**

**Scripps Institution of Oceanography**

**PIER PROJECT REPORT**

February 2005  
CEC-500-2005-002



**California Climate Change Center  
Report Series Number 2005-001**

***Prepared By:***

Scripps Institution of Oceanography  
Climate Research Division  
David W. Pierce  
La Jolla, California  
Contract No. 500-02-004  
Work Authorization MR-004

***Prepared For:***

**California Energy Commission**

Public Interest Energy Research (PIER) Program

Guido Franco,  
***Contract Manager***

Kelly Birkinshaw,  
***Program Area Team Lead  
Energy-Related Environmental Research***

Ron Kukulka,  
***Acting Deputy Director***  
**ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION**

Robert L. Therkelsen  
***Executive Director***

**DISCLAIMER**

This report was prepared as the result of work sponsored by the California Energy Commission. It does not necessarily represent the views of the Energy Commission, its employees or the State of California. The Energy Commission, the State of California, its employees, contractors and subcontractors make no warrant, express or implied, and assume no legal liability for the information in this report; nor does any party represent that the uses of this information will not infringe upon privately owned rights. This report has not been approved or disapproved by the California Energy Commission nor has the California Energy Commission passed upon the accuracy or adequacy of the information in this report.

## Acknowledgements

The analysis in this work would not have been possible without the sponsorship of the California Energy Commission under the California Climate Change Center, and of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration under the California Energy Security Project. The model runs were generated and obtained as part of the Accelerated Climate Prediction Initiative (ACPI) program, funded by the Department of Energy under grant DE-FG03-98ER62505. The runs were performed at the National Partnership for Advanced Computer Infrastructure (NPACI) at the San Diego Supercomputer Center, with the help of Peter Arzberger and Giridhar Chukkpalli, and at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, with the help of John Drake. We acknowledge the Center for Computational Sciences-Climate and Carbon Research (CCS-CCR) at Oak Ridge for computational resources used to generate those model results.

Please cite this report as follows:

Pierce, David W. 2004. *Effects of North Pacific Oscillation and ENSO on Seasonally Averaged Temperatures in California*. Climate Research Division, Scripps Institution of Oceanography. California Energy Commission, PIER Energy-Related Environmental Research. CEC-500-2005-002.

## Preface

The Public Interest Energy Research (PIER) Program supports public interest energy research and development that will help improve the quality of life in California by bringing environmentally safe, affordable, and reliable energy services and products to the marketplace.

The PIER Program, managed by the California Energy Commission (Energy Commission), annually awards up to \$62 million to conduct the most promising public interest energy research by partnering with Research, Development, and Demonstration (RD&D) organizations, including individuals, businesses, utilities, and public or private research institutions.

PIER funding efforts are focused on the following RD&D program areas:

- Buildings End-Use Energy Efficiency
- Energy Innovations Small Grant Program
- Energy-Related Environmental Research
- Energy Systems Integration Environmentally Preferred Advanced Generation
- Industrial/Agricultural/Water End-Use Energy Efficiency
- Renewable Energy Technologies

**The California Climate Change Center (CCCC)** is sponsored by the PIER program and coordinated by its Energy-Related Environmental Research area. The Center is managed by the California Energy Commission, Scripps Institution of Oceanography at the University of California at San Diego, and the University of California at Berkeley. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography conducts and administers research on climate change detection, analysis, and modeling; and the University of California at Berkeley conducts and administers research on economic analyses and policy issues. The Center also supports the Global Climate Change Grant Program, which offers competitive solicitations for climate research.

**The California Climate Change Center Report Series** details ongoing Center-sponsored research. As interim project results, these reports receive minimal editing, and the information contained in these reports may change; authors should be contacted for the most recent project results. By providing ready access to this timely research, the Center seeks to inform the public and expand dissemination of climate change information; thereby leveraging collaborative efforts and increasing the benefits of this research to California's citizens, environment, and economy.

The work described in this report was conducted under the Preliminary Climatic Data Collection, Analyses, and Modeling contract, contract number 500-02-004, Work Authorization MR-004, by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

For more information on the PIER Program, please visit the Energy Commission's Web site [www.energy.ca.gov/pier/](http://www.energy.ca.gov/pier/) or contact the Energy Commission at (916) 654-4628.

## **Abstract**

The North Pacific Oscillation (NPO) and the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) have effects on California that are of interest to energy producers and consumers. In particular, changes in the NPO are associated with statewide shifts in simultaneous wintertime temperatures, and, to a lesser extent, temperatures in the following summer. Observations over the period 1960 to 2001 indicate that the seasonally averaged temperature anomaly associated with the NPO is about 0.7 C in winter and 0.2 C in summer. The response is not linear; the warmth associated with positive NPO events is stronger than the cooling associated with negative NPO events. The seasonal temperature changes are accomplished by a simple shift in the distribution of daily average temperatures over much of California. However, over the Sierra Nevada, the shape of the daily temperature distribution changes as well, with the positive phase of the NPO associated with a smaller standard deviation in daily average temperature. This effect is probably too small to be of practical importance for energy producers, however. The seasonally averaged difference in temperature due to the NPO makes about a 150-heating-degree-day difference over the winter. The change in seasonally averaged temperatures due to ENSO is a considerably weaker effect than that due to the NPO; effects on energy producers due to ENSO are therefore more likely to arise from changes in precipitation in the Pacific Northwest.

# 1. Introduction

Large-scale climate fluctuations such as the North Pacific Oscillation (NPO) and the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) have systematic effects on California's temperature. Some of these effects are of interest to the energy industry. For example, colder winters result in greater demand for natural gas for space heating, while hotter summers result in greater peak electricity loads.

The purpose of this note is to quantify these effects, in both observations and in global climate models. Of particular interest will be the seasonality of the climate signal—warm summers present a very different energy stress than cold winters—as well as the manner in which the climate variability is accomplished (e.g., colder average winters being accomplished by the increased likelihood of a few very cold days versus many slightly cooler days). Both observations and models are evaluated so the fidelity of modeling studies of California's climate can be evaluated. Such modeling studies might focus on global change due to anthropogenic effects over the coming decades, or on dynamical model predictions of California's climate on the seasonal timescale.

This report is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly describes the NPO and ENSO; Section 3 outlines the data sources; Section 4 describes the influence of the NPO on California; and Section 5 examines the effect of ENSO. Section 6 presents a summary, and includes conclusions that can be drawn about the ability of models to capture these climate signals over California.

## 2. Climate Indices

### *a. North Pacific Oscillation (NPO)*

The NPO (Walker 1923; Walker and Bliss 1932) is a large-scale fluctuation of atmospheric pressure and sea surface temperatures in the North Pacific. Figure 1 illustrates the observed wintertime sea surface temperature (SST) and sea level pressure (SLP) anomalies associated with the NPO. (Anomalies are departures from conditions normal for that time of year.) The NPO is also related to winter temperatures over North America (e.g., Latif and Barnett 1994; Trenberth and Hurrell 1994). The physical mechanism of the relationship is that low values of the NPO index are associated with southerly air flow along the west coast of North America, which tends to advect warmer southern air into the region (Trenberth and Hurrell 1994). High values are associated with northerly flow, with the corresponding advection of colder, subpolar air into the region. Figure 1 illustrates the negative phase of the NPO. To a reasonable approximation, the positive phase is the opposite of the negative phase.

Various indices are used to describe the NPO—for example, an index of area-weighted mean sea level pressure averaged over 30°N to 65°N, 160°E to 140°W (Trenberth and Hurrell 1994). The "Pacific Decadal Oscillation" (PDO) (Mantua et al. 1997) uses an index based on the leading empirical orthogonal function (EOF) of sea surface temperature (SST) anomalies in the Pacific, north of 20°N. In this work we will use the latter definition, taken over winter (December-January-February, or DJF), when the NPO is strongest. Values for the index can be obtained from <http://jisao.washington.edu/pdo/PDO.latest>.

The global SST dataset used here is the da Silva version of the Comprehensive Ocean-Atmosphere Data Set (COADS) data set (da Silva et al. 1995), supplemented by National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) temperatures after 1993.

The sea level pressure data set is from the National Center for Atmospheric Research-National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCAR-NCEP) reanalysis program, and covers the period 1949 to 2000.




Figure 1. Observed winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) sea surface temperature anomaly (top, degrees C) and sea level pressure anomaly (bottom, millibars) associated with the North Pacific Oscillation, over the period 1949-2000.

Generally speaking, the NPO has a "red" spectrum (Pierce 2001), with more energy in multiyear to decadal timescales than in annual timescales. This raises the possibility that persistence might yield usable forecast information for changes related to the NPO, despite the fact that the NPO itself has not been shown to be predictable. This long-timescale variability is reflected in the fact that the NPO tends to go through long periods when it is either predominantly positive or predominantly negative. For example, over the period 1947 to 1976 (years are indicated by the year of the January in the Dec-Jan-Feb average), there were 19 negative years and 11 positive years; during the period 1977 to 1998, there were 4 negative years and 18 positive years; and during the period 1999 to 2002, there were 4 negative years and 0 positive years.

The model evaluated here is the Parallel Climate Model (PCM) (Washington et al. 2000). This is a global coupled ocean-atmosphere general circulation model (O-A GCM) run at an atmospheric resolution of T42 (approximately  $2.8^\circ$  in latitude and longitude), and an oceanic resolution of 384 gridpoints by 288 gridpoints (approximately  $2/3^\circ$  resolution on average). The model includes a land surface model with parameterized vegetation, and a full dynamic-thermodynamic sea ice model. The results shown here are from the "B06.62" control run, which is 600 years long. No flux correction is used in the model. PCM was the model used in the Accelerated Climate Prediction Initiative (ACPI) demonstration project (Barnett et al. 2004), which evaluated future changes in the hydrological cycle of the west due to anthropogenic forcing. It was the use of PCM in the ACPI project that motivates its use here (in the context of energy issues), as hydropower is an important source of power for the western U.S. electrical grid.

Figure 2 shows the model's version of the NPO. The model captures the strength of the SST anomaly pattern accurately (about  $0.6^\circ\text{C}$ ), although the pattern of warm anomalies extends about 20 degrees too far to the east. The SLP anomaly is stronger in the model than observed (5 mb vs. 3 mb), which means the model

might have the tendency to exaggerate the wind anomalies associated with the NPO. The location and pattern of the SLP anomaly closely matches that observed.




Figure 2. Modeled winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) sea surface temperature anomaly (top, degrees C) and sea level pressure anomaly (bottom, millibars) associated with the North Pacific Oscillation.

### *b. El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO)*

The El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) is a large-scale, coupled ocean-atmosphere climate fluctuation that originates in the equatorial Pacific ocean. It is so named because it was found that the oceanic cycle of El Niños and La Niñas, and the atmospheric cycle of the Southern Oscillation, are different parts of the same coupled ocean-atmosphere phenomenon. An El Niño is associated with warmer than usual water in a strip along the central to eastern tropical Pacific and enhanced large-scale convection (storm activity) in the same region. A La Niña, by contrast, is associated with colder than normal water in the central tropical Pacific. Although ENSO itself is confined to the tropical Pacific, atmospheric waves can carry ENSO's effects into the extratropics, leading to responses there that are typically called "El Niño" or "La Niña." The remote response is typically strongest in the winter hemisphere, i.e., between December and March over North America.

The index of ENSO used here is called the "Niño 3.4 index," and is the sea surface temperature anomaly averaged over the region 5°S to 5°N, 180° to 140°W. Figure 3 (top panel) shows the regression of the observed Niño 3.4 index on global SST anomalies; the characteristic signature of El Niño, the tongue of warmer than usual water in the tropical Pacific, is easily seen. La Niña has a similar pattern, but with the opposite sign.




Figure 3. Regression pattern ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) between the DJF Niño3.4 index and DJF SST anomalies over the Pacific ocean.

There is no fixed standard for when an El Niño or La Niña exists, partly because different parts of the world are sensitive to different locations of remote forcing in the tropics, and partly because different locations are sensitive to ENSO's effects at different times of the year. For North America, a useful and practical definition of an El Niño is when the Niño 3.4 SST index is greater than 0.5 C, and a La Niña is when the index is less than -0.5 C.

The model has an ENSO cycle that is similar to that observed, but extends too far to the west (Figure 3, bottom panel). This is a common failing in numerical O-G GCMs (Mehoso et al. 1995) for reasons that are not clear. Otherwise, the amplitude of the model's ENSO cycle is quite similar to that observed, both along the tropical strip and in the central North Pacific. The model has an exaggerated response in the Gulf of Alaska, however.

### 3. Data sources

The station data used here is primarily from the Groisman (pers. comm.) data set of station data throughout the United States. California stations were selected from the criterion that no more than 10% of the data values (minimum and maximum temperature) could be missing over the period of interest, 1960 to 2001. One hundred and thirty-four stations passed this criterion. The average temperature for the day was calculated as the average of the station's minimum and maximum temperatures.

For presentation of station data, a subset of the full set of California stations is shown. The stations used are based upon those used by those used by California Energy Commission (Energy Commission) for their climate and weather modeling, and are intended to be representative of local climate conditions ("climate zones"). Table 1 shows the 12 stations included. San Jose International Airport (COOP station ID 047824) is used by the Energy Commission as a climate zone station, but does not appear in the Groisman data set.

Data for this station were downloaded from

<http://nndc.noaa.gov/?http://ols.nndc.noaa.gov/plolstore/plsql/olstore.prodspecific?prodnum=C00122MAN-S0001> (accessed 31 July 2003).

**Table 1. Stations used to represent California "climate zones."**

Station name	COOP-ID	Lat (N)	Lon (W)	HDD	CDD
Eureka WFO Woodley Is	042910	40.8	124.15	4108	-
Ukiah	049122	39.13	123.2	-	881
Sacramento FAA airport	047630	38.52	121.5	2433	1255
Fresno Yosemite Int'l	043257	36.77	119.72	2249	2082
San Francisco WSO AP	047769	37.62	122.38	2583	164
Long Beach	045085	33.82	118.15	-	1201
Los Angeles WSO AP	045114	33.93	118.4	1207	-
San Diego WSO AP	047740	32.73	117.17	1124	767
Burbank-Glendale-Pas AP	041194	34.2	118.37	1388	1432
Blythe	040924	33.62	114.6	1034	4315
San Bernardino F S 226	047723	34.13	117.25	1445	1966
San Jose Int'l AP	047824	37.36	121.93	2054	835

COOP=National Cooperative Observer Program; HDD=heating degree days; CDD=cooling degree days.

Heating and cooling degree days (HDD and CDD) are calculated from the station data using a baseline of 65°F. In other words:

$$CDD = \max\left(\frac{T_{\min} + T_{\max}}{2} - 65, 0\right) \quad (1)$$

$$HDD = \max\left(65 - \frac{T_{\min} + T_{\max}}{2}, 0\right) \quad (2)$$

where the daily minimum and maximum temperatures,  $T_{\min}$  and  $T_{\max}$ , are given in degrees Fahrenheit. As they are defined from the point of view of an energy generator, a "cooling degree day" is related to high air conditioner use, and so large CDD tend to occur in the summer. A "heating degree day" is related to high furnace or heater use, and large HDD tend to occur in winter.

Many of the station data showed strong trends over the period of record. Part of this is presumably due to urban heat island effects, which are not of interest here. Therefore, all the station data were detrended before use.

#### 4. Influence of NPO on California temperatures

The influence the NPO has on California temperatures will first be shown by histograms at the stations representing the climate zones, stratified by phase of the NPO, and then as regressions across the entire state.

##### *a. Histograms of HDD and CDD by phase of the NPO*

The main effects of the NPO are felt during winter, however, for the purposes of the energy industry it is useful to examine summer as well. In this section winter will be taken as the average from October to March, while summer will be taken as the average over May to September. It should be kept in mind that the NPO index used here is based on winter conditions, so the analysis is simultaneous for the winter but incorporates a degree of persistence for the summer. In other words, the summer conditions are evaluated based upon the preceding winter's NPO.

Figure 4 shows HDD and CDD distributions for the positive and negative phases of the NPO. HDD and CDD values are anomalies from mean seasonal values, where winter (Oct-Mar) is used for HDD and summer (May-Sep) is used for CDD. Also shown is the average value of the anomaly obtained when the NPO is in the positive and negative phase. Table 1 shows the mean HDD and CDD values for the 12 climate zone stations, so that the size of the anomalies can be evaluated. Roughly speaking, the NPO makes a difference of about 5% to HDD (wintertime conditions), somewhat less than that in summer.




Figure 4a. HDD (left column) and CDD (right column) distributions for stations representative of California climate zones. The distributions for the positive phase of the NPO are shown by the heavy dashed line; for the negative phase of the NPO, by the thin solid line. Data has been detrended before analysis; departures from mean conditions are shown. HDD values are winter (Oct-March) average, CDD values are summer (May-Sep) averages.




Figure 4b. (continued)




Figure 4c. (continued)









Figure 4d. (continued)

The possibility that the difference in HDD and CDD between the positive and negative phases of the NPO (NPO+ and NPO-) arises solely out of sampling fluctuations should be considered. This can be evaluated by using a Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test, which estimates the likelihood that the NPO+ and NPO- distributions are actually drawn from the same underlying distribution, and differ only due to chance, given the relatively short period of analysis (42 years). The results of the K-S tests are shown in Figure 4. Small numbers mean that it is unlikely that the observed differences arise by chance. For example, the top left panel of Figure 4a indicates that there is only a 1 in 10,000 (0.0001) chance that the observed difference in HDD distributions in Eureka would be found by chance. On the other hand, the top right panel (Eureka CDD) shows that there is almost a 50% likelihood of getting the CDD result by chance. The data therefore support the conclusion that the NPO affects wintertime conditions in Eureka (HDD), but not summertime conditions (CDD).

Overall, nine of the twelve climate zone stations show a difference in winter HDD between the NPO+ and NPO- phases that is significant at the 5% level. An additional two (Blythe and Long Beach) would be considered significant were the criterion relaxed to the 10% level. Only San Bernardino shows no wintertime effect of the NPO.

During summer, the relationships tend to be weaker. Out of the twelve climate zone stations, three are significant at the 5% level and another one (San Diego) would be included at the 10% level. It should be kept in mind, though, that the preceding winter value for the NPO is used when evaluating the summer conditions. This is therefore a kind of minimalist prediction scheme based on persistence.

### ***b. Geographical pattern of correlation with the NPO***

In addition to the shifting histograms at various stations, it is interesting to examine how the pattern of correlation varies across all stations in the state. This is shown in Figure 5 for winter (left panel) and summer (right panel) seasonal average temperature anomalies. Note that this is the correlation of actual temperature anomaly, not of HDD/CDD, as shown previously. It has been suggested (e.g., Sailor and Munoz 1997) that the so-called "primitive variables" such as temperature correlate to energy use better than derived variables such as HDD/CDD, so it is useful to examine both. The basis of the correlations is the winter (DJF) NPO index; therefore, it is a simultaneous correlation for the DJF temperature anomalies, while the correlations for the JJA (June-July-August) temperatures are based on the preceding winter.

Both summer and winter correlations are generally positive, which means that positive phases of the NPO are associated with warmer summers and winters. In winter, the correlations are strongest along the coast, and in the northern part of the state. This is in accord with the mechanism of the NPO, as described in Section 2a.

The correlation between the PCM's NPO index and monthly average temperature anomalies is shown in Figure 6. The most obvious difference between the model and observed results is that the reported correlations with the simultaneous DJF temperatures (left panel) is much stronger in the model than in the observations. However, keep in mind that the observed correlations are with daily temperatures, while the model correlations are with seasonally averaged temperatures (daily temperatures were not kept for the long model control run used here, so a direct comparison is not possible). This averaging will naturally result in greater correlation, as the random effects of unpredictable storms are smoothed over. Overall, it is certainly true that the model reproduces a strong NPO-driven signal in temperatures over California, and that this is a feature of the observations as well, particularly in winter. In summer (right panel of Figure 6), the model correlations are weaker than observed, even with the averaging. This suggests that the model is missing an important part of the summer NPO-driven response over California.




Figure 5. Observed correlation between the DJF NPO index and daily average temperature anomalies for the contemporaneous DJF (left panel) and the following JJA (right panel).





Figure 6. The model's correlation between the DJF NPO index and monthly average temperature anomalies for the contemporaneous DJF (left panel) and the following JJA (right panel).

### *c. Composite Temperature Maps*


The correlations shown above are useful in that they are independent of possible changes in amplitude of the response; i.e., it could be imagined that a coastal city and an inland city might have approximately the same correlation with the NPO index, but the coastal city might have a smaller overall swing in temperature due to the NPO because of the nearby, moderating influence of the ocean. Also, correlations assume linearity (i.e., that the response to a low NPO condition is exactly opposite that of a high NPO condition), which may not be true. For both these reasons, it is useful to examine actual temperature composites based on the NPO index as well.

Figure 7 show the seasonal temperature anomalies composited for the upper (top row) and lower (bottom row) terciles of the NPO index. Figure 8 is similar, but the units are in degree days. Considering first the high state of the NPO, the winter response (top left panel of Figure 7) shows a monotonic warm response over California. The amplitude of the response is greatest (approaching 1 C) over the northern mountainous regions, with the most moderate response (0.4 C) over the San Francisco bay area. In the following summer (top right panel of Figure 7), the amplitude of the response drops to 0.2 C or less. Additionally, there is a negative response in a narrow band of coastal cities, which seems to push into the interior near the San Francisco bay. This is potentially important from the point of view of the energy industry, as the San Jose "swing" region (so named because hot temperatures there can dramatically affect peak state energy use in summer) lies in this oppositely signed region.



/data/obs/station\_data/groisman/stations/ca\_stations/90pct\_good/plot\_contour\_Tavg\_npo.Tavg.R Wed Apr 14 12:45:27 2004

Figure 7. Observed seasonal mean temperature anomalies (°C) composited on terciles of the winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) NPO index. Top row: for the highest tercile of the NPO index. Bottom row: for the lowest tercile. Left column: for the contemporaneous winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) season. Right column: for the subsequent summer (Jun-Jul-Aug) season. Contour interval is 0.05°C; negative contours are dashed. Dots indicate location of the stations used.



/data/obs/station\_data/groisman/stations/ca\_stations/90pct\_good/plot\_contour\_Tavg\_npo.HDD-CDD.R Wed Apr 14 12:46:59 2004

Figure 8. Observed seasonal mean heating and cooling degree day anomalies composited on terciles of the winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) NPO index. Top row: for the highest tercile of the NPO index. Bottom row: for the lowest tercile. Left column: for the contemporaneous winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) season. Right column: for the subsequent summer (Jun-Jul-Aug) season. Contour interval is 10 degree days; negative contours are dashed. Dots indicate location of the stations used.

The composite seasonal average temperature anomalies for low NPO conditions are shown in the bottom row of Figure 7. First off, it is clear that during winter, the response during low NPO conditions (lower left panel) is not simply the opposite of the response during high NPO conditions (top left panel). The response is distinctly weaker during low NPO conditions, with cold anomalies over the bulk of the north-central state being about  $-0.25^{\circ}\text{C}$ , compared to  $+0.5$  or greater when the NPO is high. Secondly, the response is not uniform across the state. The inland desert regions experience a positive response, while coastal regions and northern California experience a negative response. This is not clearly brought out in the correlation maps because of the intrinsically linear nature of that analysis. For the summer following low NPO conditions (lower right panel), the response is near uniform over the state, with conditions about  $0.3^{\circ}\text{C}$  cooler than the mean. There is no sign of a distinct local response over the San Francisco bay area during the summer following low NPO conditions, unlike the summer following high NPO conditions.

Figures 9 and 10 show the analogous figures generated using the model data instead of the observed data. The model's response is somewhat weak during high NPO events in the winter (with modeled temperature anomalies in the range of  $0.4$  to  $0.6^{\circ}\text{C}$ , observed anomalies  $0.7^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and somewhat too strong during low NPO events (model:  $-0.4$  to  $-0.6^{\circ}\text{C}$ ; observed:  $0.0$  to  $-0.3^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). In general, the model has a very symmetric response, such that the temperature anomaly field when the NPO is in the highest tercile is close to the negative of the field when the NPO is in the lowest tercile. The real world shows more non-linearities than the model manages to capture, with the high NPO response over California being distinctly stronger than the low NPO response.




Figure 9. Model seasonal mean temperature anomalies ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) composited on terciles of the model's winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) NPO index. Top row: for the highest tercile of the NPO index. Bottom row: for the lowest tercile. Left column: for the contemporaneous winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) season. Right column: for the subsequent summer (Jun-Jul-Aug) season. Contour interval is  $0.05^{\circ}\text{C}$ ; negative contours are dashed. Dots indicate location of the stations used.




Figure 10. Model seasonal mean heating and cooling degree day anomalies composited on terciles of the model's winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) NPO index. Top row: for the highest tercile of the NPO index. Bottom row: for the lowest tercile. Left column: for the contemporaneous winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) season. Right column: for the subsequent summer (Jun-Jul-Aug) season. Contour interval is 10 degree days; negative contours are dashed. Dots indicate location of the stations used.

#### *d. Differences in daily temperature*

The previous sections deal with seasonal differences in average temperature, and generally show that high NPO conditions are associated with warming over the state, while low NPO conditions are associated with cooling. However, for the purposes of energy producers, the manner in which the warming and cooling is accomplished is important. For example, were the winters warmer because of the lack of especially cold winter days, or because of a surfeit of particularly warm winter days? Or was the change accomplished simply by a uniform shift in the distribution of daily temperatures, with little change to the warm or cold tails of the distribution? Each possibility could potentially lead energy producers to a different strategy for dealing with the situation.

The way in which the change in seasonal average temperature is accomplished can be examined by comparing the distributions of daily average temperature obtained during the high and low NPO terciles. The mean of the distributions is first removed, since for this purpose we want to examine whether the shape of the distributions is different. This can again be evaluated by a K-S test, as was done before.

The results of this analysis are shown in Figure 11. Plotted are the significance values estimated by the K-S test for the difference in shape seen between the distributions of daily average temperature anomaly when the NPO is high and when it is low. Low values indicate that the difference in shape between the daily distributions is more than would be expected due to sampling fluctuations alone. We are using here an a priori significance test, which means that 1% of the stations would be expected to turn up as significant at the 0.01 level by chance alone. For winter conditions (DJF - left panel), 8 of the 134 stations (6%) show a significant difference at the 0.01 level; 24 (18%) are significant at the 0.05 level; and 41 (31%) are significant at the 10% level. Since three to six times as many stations are found to be significant as would be expected by chance, this analysis supports the idea that the NPO can lead to changes in the shape of daily temperature distributions, rather than simply shifts with no change in shape. Figure 11 shows that these changes are not uniform across the state. Rather, they are seen in a band stretching along the Sierra Nevada from northern California down to central California, then swinging westward into the Los Angeles basin. The summer results (right panel) are distinctly weaker, with only 3 of 134 stations (2%) significant at the 0.01 level, 6 (4.5%) significant at the 0.05 level, and 16 (12%) significant at the 0.10 level. These are not particularly different from what would be expected due to chance, given the a priori statistics.

### **5. Influence of ENSO on California temperatures**

In this section the effect of ENSO on California temperatures will be shown in a manner analogous to the NPO, for both the observations and the model.

#### *a. Histograms of HDD and CDD by phase of ENSO*

The main effects of ENSO that arise from the teleconnected response to tropical Pacific forcing are felt during the winter over North America. However, there may also be a more locally forced response due to changes in SST during the summer, so the analysis will include the summer season as well. It should be noted that, in keeping with traditional usage of "El Niño" (warm tropical Pacific) and "La Niña" (cool tropical Pacific) events, this analysis will use a cutoff of 0.5 C for the Niño 3.4 index. In other words, El Niños will be defined as the Niño 3.4 index being greater than 0.5 C, and La Niñas as the index being less than -0.5 C. This is in contrast to the analysis using the NPO index, where the histograms were constructed based merely on the sign of the NPO index, and the subsequent analysis was done on terciles of the NPO index.




Figure 11. Significance values testing whether daily average temperature distributions have the same shape during high and low NPO conditions. Small significance values indicate differences between the distributions that were unlikely to have arisen from chance. See text for details.

Figure 12 shows the HDD and CDD distributions for El Niño and La Niña at the representative California climate stations identified in Table 1.

The most striking thing compared to the NPO results (Figure 4) is the relatively weak effect ENSO has on California temperatures, compared to the effect of the NPO. Only a few stations have a statistically significant response, even in winter, while most of the stations did for the NPO.

This can easily be seen in the correlation of seasonal average temperature at each station with the Niño 3.4 index (Figure 13). The values are much weaker than the NPO values (Figure 5). In other words, ENSO generally accounts for less of the variability in California seasonal average temperatures than does the NPO. (It should be kept in mind that ENSO has much more influence on the precipitation.) The model results (Figure 14) are similar, although a somewhat stronger relationship between ENSO and wintertime temperatures is found.




Figure 12a. HDD (left column) and CDD (right column) distributions for stations representative of California climate zones. The distributions for El Niño are shown by the heavy dashed line; for La Niña, by the thin solid line. Data has been detrended before analysis; departures from mean conditions are shown. HDD values are winter (Oct-March) average, CDD values are summer (May-Sep) averages.




Figure 12b. (continued)









Figure 12c. (continued).




Figure 12d. (continued)




Figure 13. Observed correlation between the Dec-Jan-Feb Niño 3.4 index and daily average temperature anomalies for the contemporaneous DJF (left panel) and the following JJA (right panel).




Figure 14. Model correlation between the Dec-Jan-Feb Niño 3.4 index and daily average temperature anomalies for the contemporaneous DJF (left panel) and the following JJA (right panel).

Composite temperature anomalies that correspond to the phases of ENSO are shown in Figure 15, while the corresponding heating and cooling degree day anomalies are shown in Figure 16. Both contours and the actual composite temperatures at each station are shown; this gives complete information at the expense of some clarity. Over most of California, El Niño is associated with somewhat colder winters (upper left panel of Figure 15). The exceptions to this are the bay area, far northern California, and the few stations in southern California directly next to the ocean. The La Niña response is, again, generally cooler winters than average over much of the state, with the exception in this case being the interior southern part of the state. Responses during the summer following an El Niño or La Niña event tend to be more uniform (right hand column of Figure 15), with slightly cooler summers following El Niño and slightly warmer summers following La Niña, but this is a weak effect.

The model results for ENSO composite temperatures are shown in Figures 17 and 18 for completeness, but again it must be kept in mind that the response is too weak to be statistically significant. This likely accounts for the discrepancies seen between the model and observed values; for instance, the observations show a weak cool response in winter to an El Niño, while the model shows a weak warm response. Neither is significant.




Figure 15. Observed temperature anomalies (degrees C) composited on the winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) Niño 3.4 (ENSO) index. Top row: for El Niño conditions. Bottom row: for La Niña conditions. Left column: for the contemporaneous winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) season. Right column: for the subsequent summer (Jun-Jul-Aug ) season. Contour interval is 0.05 C; negative contours are dashed.




Figure 16. Observed heating and cooling degree day anomalies composited on the winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) Niño 3.4 (ENSO) index. Top row: for El Niño conditions. Bottom row: for La Niña conditions. Left column: for the contemporaneous winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) season. Right column: for the subsequent summer (Jun-Jul-Aug) season. Contour interval is 10 degree days; negative contours are dashed.




Figure 17. Model temperature anomalies (degrees C) composited on the winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) Niño 3.4 (ENSO) index. Top row: for El Niño conditions. Bottom row: for La Niña conditions. Left column: for the contemporaneous winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) season. Right column: for the subsequent summer (Jun-Jul-Aug) season. Contour interval is 0.05 C; negative contours are dashed.




Figure 18. Model heating and cooling degree day anomalies composited on the winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) Niño 3.4 (ENSO) index. Top row: for El Niño conditions. Bottom row: for La Niña conditions. Left column: for the contemporaneous winter (Dec-Jan-Feb) season. Right column: for the subsequent summer (Jun-Jul-Aug) season. Contour interval is 10 degree days; negative contours are dashed.

## 6. Summary

The effect of the North Pacific Oscillation (NPO) and the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) on seasonal average temperatures in California has been shown, using both observed station data covering 1960 to 2001 and the output of a 600-year control run of the Parallel Climate Model (PCM). Generally speaking, the NPO has a stronger effect on California's seasonally averaged temperatures than does ENSO, with predominately warmer winters when the NPO is positive and colder winters when the NPO is negative. The response in the following summer (Jun-Jul-Aug) is weaker than the simultaneous winter relation, but has the same sign (warmer with positive NPO, cooler with weaker NPO).

Although it varies by station, averaged over all of California, the NPO makes a difference of about 150 HDD during the winter season. This is about a 5% effect.

The model has a reasonably accurate depiction of the NPO, with the noticeable downside that the model response is more linear than observed. Specifically, the model response to negative NPO conditions is almost opposite the response to positive NPO conditions, while in the observations, the response to negative NPO conditions is distinctly weaker than to positive NPO conditions. This suggests that the model's projections for winter response in conditions of negative NPO should be taken with a grain of salt. The model and the observations disagree as to the response in California temperature to an ENSO event, however, since neither response is statistically significant, it should be assumed that the source of this difference is sampling variability.

## References

- Barnett, T. P., R. Malone, W. Pennell, D. Stammer, A. Semtner, W. Washington, 2004: ACPI project overview and summary. *Climatic Change*, in press.
- da Silva, A. M., C. C. Young, S. Levitus, 1995: Atlas of Surface Marine Data 1994, Volume 1: Algorithms and Procedures. NOAA Atlas NESDIS 6, U.S. Dept. Commerce, 299 pp.
- Latif, M., T. P. Barnett, 1994: Causes of Decadal Climate Variability over the North Pacific and North America. *Science*, v. 266 p. 634-637.
- Mantua, N. J., S. R. Hare, Y. Zhang, J. M. Wallace, R. C. Francis, 1997: A Pacific Interdecadal Climate Oscillation with Impacts on Salmon Production. *Bull. Amer. Met. Soc.*, v. 78 p. 1069-1079.
- Mechoso, C. R., A. W. Robertson, N. Barth, M. K. Davey, P. Delecluse, P. R. Gent, S. Ineson, B. Kirtman, M. Latif, H. Le Treut, T. Nagai, J. D. Neelin, S. G. Philander, J. Polcher, P. S. Schopf, T. Stockdale, M. J. Suarez, L. Terray, O. Thual, J. J. Tribbia, 1995: The Seasonal Cycle over the Tropical Pacific in Coupled Ocean-Atmosphere General Circulation Models. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, v. 123 p. 2825-2838.
- Pierce, D. W., 2001: Distinguishing Coupled Ocean-Atmosphere Interactions from Background Noise in the North Pacific. *Prog. Oceanogr.*, v. 49 p. 331-352.
- Sailor, D. J., J. R. Munoz, 1997: Sensitivity of electricity and natural gas consumption to climate in the USA - Methodology and results for eight states. *Energy*, v. 22 p. 987-998.
- Trenberth, K. E., J. W. Hurrell, 1994: Decadal atmosphere-ocean variations in the Pacific. *Climate Dynamics*, v. 9 p. 303-319.
- Walker, G. T., E. W. Bliss, 1932: World weather V. *Mem. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, v. 4 p. 53-84.
- Walker, G. T., 1923: Correlation in seasonal variations in weather III: A preliminary study of world weather. *Mem. Indian Meteor. Dept.*, v. 24 p. 75-121.
- Washington, W. M., J. W. Weatherly, G. A. Meehl, A. J. Semtner, T. W. Bettge, A. P. Craig, W. G. Strand, J. Arblaster, V. B. Wayland, R. James, Y. Zhang, 2000: Parallel Climate Model (PCM) control and transient simulations. *Climate Dynamics*, v. 16 p. 755-74.